



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_47981
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors that Influence Online Purchasing Behavior among Students in Universiti Utara Malaysia
Type of the Article	Research article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. The manuscript has grammatical and spelling errors and authors need to review the manuscript for this weakness.</p> <p>2. Abstract needs to be reframed to cater to what is being done, why it is being done and how it is being done.</p> <p>3. Theory building needs to go from argument to conclusion. The authors writing style goes from conclusion to argument and therefore, to rebuilding of the manuscript is weak. Furthermore, argumentative approach of the authors to words the paper is very weak.</p> <p>4. Usually manuscripts are written in third person and a reference to us and we are not accepted. The authors need to reframe the manuscript to remove all reference to we and us.</p> <p>5. line 53 to 55 ... I could not understand the role of the statement in the argument which is centrally stating that young people are majority online shoppers.</p> <p>6. The authors have not argued why they are using attitude towards online shopping and purchase behavior interchangeably. The two concepts are quite different.</p> <p>7. The manuscripts are written in past tense and therefore authors need to reframe the manuscript in past tense. the tense in the manuscript keep changing.</p> <p>8. The authors have not mentioned as to why TNB residential hall was selected? is it the only hall? If not then why was it selected and how? if it is only hall then wasn't other means of interviewing explored? Random sampling also requires details in terms of how randomization was ensured. The authors need to mention how 262 students was selected out of 757.</p> <p>9. The authors are more into teaching and not discussing their results.</p> <p>10. why is the female population in this hall higher? is this representative of the national trend? or is it representative of the target population? else it could be a sampling error.</p> <p>11. the results are missing interpretation. authors mention the allowance in line 162-165... but fail to mention what is the importance? what does it mean? it seems majority 60% plus respondents were between RM0 to RM200. makes me question are they right online shopping segment? authors need to argue this aspect?</p> <p>12. reliability should always be calculated of dimensions of a construct. why would you do factor analysis if it was single dimensions construct? Alpha of .912 is also not right because it means all items are showing same thing. NO use of having multi item construct then. why would you calculate reliability of dependent and independent scale together? that is methodologically wrong.</p> <p>13. the sample size is varying in the manuscript between 262 to 265.. what is it.</p> <p>14. Factor analysis is never applied on dependent and independent variables together.</p> <p>15. the choice of methodology is such that it cannot fulfill the</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>objective. it is not clear what the authors are trying to achieve? factor analysis is a dimension reduction technique. The authors are not talking about cross loadings or problematic items. In my experience. such a clean loading factor analysis is rarely possible. 16. The authors need to argue the use of methodology. The conclusion section gives certain conclusions which cannot be drawn from factor analysis.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>Conceptually and methodologically wrong. Very weak theory building, grammatical errors, conclusions do not flow from the analysis</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Deepti Gupta
Department, University & Country	Panjab University, India